

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.: 10/817,276) Date: December 11, 2007
Date Filed: April 2, 2004) Examiner: Dwivedi, Vikansha S.
Applicant: Joseph Spadola Jr.) Art Unit: 3746
Title: Computer Monitoring System for Pumps)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sirs:

RESPONSE AND AMENDMENT

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 12, 2007, Applicant offers the following response and amendments to the Office Action, and requests reconsideration of the above-captioned application. This response addresses every ground of rejection set forth in the Office Action.

REMARKS

The examiner requires a new oath or declaration for the instant patent application. The examiner requires the drawings to be amended to include the following: a sump pit 2; a level sensing assembly positioned with the sump pit; item numbers 72, 73; and the local sensors outside of the sump pit. The examiner also stated that the drawings need to be corrected because “hand written numerals on the drawing are informal”. Page 11, line 19 of the specification is objected to because “by not” is shown, where a “may not” appears to be proper. The examiner rejects claims 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber et al. (5,672,050) in view of Kan et al. (4,808,077). Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber in view of Kan and further in view of Hakansson et al. (4,296,633). The examiner states that claims 4-44 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.